DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 989 EA 022 557

AUTHOR Nakao, Ronald D.
TITLE Desegregation and Informed Choice.
INSTITUTION San Jose Unified School District, Calif.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Busing; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Utilization; Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; *Parent Attitudes; *School Choice; *School Desegregation; Student Transportation; Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS San Jose Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

Information sources used by parents of majority and minority students in making decisions about school choice, with a focus on busing, are examined in this report. A mailed survey of parents of approximately 8,431 students in the San Jose Unified School District (California) yielded 934 responses, of which minority households comprised 60 percent and majority households, 40 percent. Findings indicate that more minority elementary students attend school outside their neighborhoods than do majority students and that minority students are assigned to higher choice schools less often than majority students. Overall, minority parents have a limited degree of informed choice in terms of information sources available to them. A conclusion is that inequities in information resources, among other things, impede the desegregation process. A copy of the survey and 12 tables are included. (6 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326989

DESEGREGATION AND INFORMED CHOICE

Ronald D. Nakao
Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor
for San José Unified School District
San José, CA 95126

March 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Nakao

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 557

Prepared for the 1989 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA March 27-31, 1989.

Introduction

Approaches to desegregation have run the spectrum from free-choice plans--where desegregation is limited by the willingness of the individual parent or student to voluntarily choose to attend a non-neighborhood school--to mandatory plans--where parents and students have little choice in their school. The free-choice approach characterized the desegregation plans of the fifties and sixties following the *Brown* decision. In 1968, in its *Green* decision, the Supreme Court ran out of patience and declared that free-choice plans could no longer be the sole method of desegregating schools when other ways were available. This and subsequent decisions by the courts began a period of forced busing, mandatory student assignments, changing school attendance areas, and a whole host of different school desegregation strategies.[1]

However, in light of the extreme controversy, resistance by parents, and potential for "White flight" generated by mandatory plans as well as the changing demographics in school districts which were becoming majority minority, the late seventies and eighties have been marked by the recognition that the desire for freedom of choice by parents is very strong and must be considered in the implementation and success of desegregation plans.

Even with this increased spotlight on freedom of choice, the lessons of the fifties and sixties were still remembered by the courts and by educational planners; free-choice plans, alone, would not work. Thus, hybrids of the two

---

[1] For a more in-depth discussion of desegregation strategies see: Alves, Michael J. and Willie, Charles V. "Controlled Choice Assignments: A New and More Effective Approach to School Desegregation" in Urban Review. Vol. 19, No. 2. pp. 67-88.; Armor, David J. Beyond Busing: Education and Choice. October 1988.; Gerwitz, Paul. "Choice in the Transition: School Desegregation and the Corrective Ideal" in Columbia Law Review. Vol. 86. pp.86-798. 1986.; Rossell, Christine H. "The Buffalo Controlled Choice Plan" in Urban Education Vol. 22, No. 3, October 1987. pp. 328-354.;

approaches began to be developed by school districts facing court-ordered desegregation. One such approach was the "controlled choice" strategy where students or parents could choose to attend any school inside or outside their neighborhood area with the control that assignment to their school choice would be limited by the conditions of the school desegregation plan.[1] Often incentives such as magnet schools and special educational programs were instituted to attract majority students to minority segregated schools or vice-versa.

The issue of choice has also arisen in educational arenas outside of desegregation. Two examples are the debate on school vouchers (Milton Friedman), and the recent proposal to allow inter-district school enrollment in California (State Superintendent Bill Honig). The proponents of these programs share the basic belief that competition between schools in the educational marketplace will maximize choice for the consumers and maximize productivity for the producers of education. Critics state that schools and families with unequal resources cannot compete on an equal basis in this educational marketplace.

In this study of desegregation and choice, the question of informed choice was investigated in regards to the sources of information used by parents of majority versus minority and non-language minority versus language minority students in making decisions about the schools they wished their children to attend. Since the availability of transportation to and from school was an important factor in deciding which school to choose, views expressed concerning busing was also looked at. The source of information was the Transportation Survey administered by the Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor in San José Unified School District in April, 1987. Insights into this issue will be

---

[1] Alves, Michael J. and Willie, Charles V. "Controlled Choice Assignments: A New and More Effective Approach to School Desegregation" in Urban Review. Vol. 19, No. 2. pp.74-75.

discussed based on the responses to survey questions on school choice and sources of information used by parents/guardians of elementary students who were attending schools outside their neighborhood attendance area.

The San José Unified School District Desegregation Plan

Geographically, the San José Unified School District is long and narrow in shape. From north to south, it extends some 26 miles; from east to west its width varies between three and nine miles. Without traffic, it takes approximately 50 minutes to travel from the northern to the southern end of the District. Historically, the minority segregated school populations have been concentrated in the older, relatively lower SES, northern end of the District, while the majority segregated school populations have been concentrated in the suburban, higher SES, southern end.

In the year prior to court-ordered desegregation, 16 of the district's 24 elementary schools, 2 of 7 middle schools, and 2 of 6 high schools were considered segregated.[1]

The approach which the Federal Court adopted was a district-wide Open Enrollment Plan. San José Unified's Open Enrollment Plan was a modification of the "controlled choice" approach. District-wide magnet schools as well as "specialty enrichment programs" and "programs of excellence" at other schools were established as an incentive to students to voluntarily choose to attend schools outside their neighborhood attendance areas which would help the

---

[1] A ±20% range about the district-wide majority enrollment at each school level defined the limits of a desegregated attendance-area school. Thus, for the first year of the desegregation plan, a desegregated elementary school ranged from 25% to 65%, a middle school ranged from 32% to 72%, and a high school ranged from 40% to 80%. District-wide magnet schools had more stringent bounds; ±15% in a magnet school's first year, ±10% in its second year, and ±5% in its third year.

desegregation process. As an added incentive, students who were "M-to-M" transfers, i.e., who would move from a school where they were the majority to one where they were the minority, were eligible for bus transportation. However, if this voluntary approach failed to desegregate the district's schools, then a "mandatory 'backup' mechanism" would be imposed. This option was based on establishing minority (majority) enrollment caps to limit the access of minority (majority) students to certain schools.[1]

In Spring 1986, San José Unified began to implement Phase I of their Open Enrollment Plan. All students were required to register for school assignment for the Fall semester. In subsequent years, only students new to the district, students changing schools, or students entering the next school level (i.e., 5th and 8th graders) would have to register for school assignment.

In Phase I, parents/guardians were given two weeks to submit their top three school choices. They could choose from any school in the district. All parents were sent a "Catalog of Educational Opportunities" which contained information on the desegregation process and descriptions of the educational programs at each of the district's schools. The Catalog was made available in English, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Parents/guardians were encouraged to do their own investigations of the different schools and their programs by studying the Catalog, visiting schools, or talking to school or district staff. After the registration period had passed, the district made every effort to assign all students to their first choice unless school/program capacities were reached or enrollment caps had been imposed. Their success in this effort was

---

[1] Diaz v. San José Unified School District. Memorandum and Order re: Desegregation Remedy. No. C-71-2130 RFP (SJ). 1986. pp.16-17.

marked by their ability to assign 99.4% (26,400) of Phase I students to their first choice school. Of this number, 54% were majority and 46% were minority.[1]

In Phase II, students new to the District or registering after the Phase I deadline registered their choices for school assignment and were assigned to those schools with space remaining. In Phase II, 5,479 students registered; 37% were majority and 63% were minority. The district's efforts to assign students their first choice was not as successful for this second phase of the assignment process. Only 20% (1,099) of majority students and 28% (1,541) of minority students received their first choice school.[2]

The importance of informed parental choice for the success of the San José Unified Desegregation Plan was spelled out in the Court Order:

> "A requirement that all students explicitly choose their preferred schools is an important component of a desegregation plan that seeks to encourage students to enroll voluntarily in schools other than those in their neighborhood attendance area . . . The requirement that each student make such a choice means . . . that parents and students will give genuine consideration to which schools are most suited to their interests and whether their neighborhood school is necessarily the best selection."[3]

If the district was to receive the support of parents and students in making desegregation work, then they would have to both encourage parents and students to actively research their school and program options as well as ensure that parents and students were allowed the opportunity and access to information. Thus, by helping parents and students to make an informed choice which would reflect their needs and which they could live with in both the short and long run,

---

1 First Semi-Annual Report: Vasquez v. San José Unified School District. Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor. October 1986. p.11.

2 ibid.

3 Diaz v. San José Unified School District. Memorandum and Order re: Desegregation Remedy. No. C-71-2130 RFP (SJ). 1986. p.17.

a smooth and successful desegregation effort could occur. Another very important factor which was related to the issue of informed choice, was the ability of students who participated in the desegregation process to be transported to schools outside of their neighborhood attendance areas. If a parent from the north (south) was going to choose a southern (northern) school for their child, the information on the availability of adequate and safe transportation would have to be provided for.

At the end of the first year of desegregation, a survey was developed to ascertain the demographic characteristics of students using transportation services, the information sources used by parents for school choice, and other facts about the bus ridership.[1] As stated previously, the results from this transportation survey forms the basis for this initial look at the issue of informed choice in school desegregation.

The Transportation Survey

In April 1987, a survey on transportation services was sent to the parents/guardians of the approximately 8,431 students that the school district had identified as eligible for bus transportation. However, at the time of the mailing, the District was unable to distinguish between those students who were eligible for busing because of desegregation purposes and those students who were eligible because they lived near a dangerous intersection.

The material received by the parents included a cover letter, the survey questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. The material was translated into

---

[1] Second Semi-Annual Report: Vasquez v. San José Unified School District. Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor. August 1987. p. 16.

Spanish, Vietnamese, and Portuguese for those students whose home language was not English.[1]

The packaging and mailing of the survey was handled by the school district. Unfortunately, an unknown number of packets were sent to parents without all the enclosures. This led to some confusion and an avalanche of phone calls by parents; new packets were sent to those parents who called. However, this mix-up in the distribution process may have decreased the survey response rate.

Survey--Total Responses

Overall, 934 completed surveys were returned. Of this number, 60% were from "minority" households, while the remaining 40% were from "majority" households.[2] The greatest number of responses came from Hispanics (42%). When broken down by school level, 62% of the responses were from elementary students (grades K-5), 13% were from middle school students (grades 6-9), and 25% were from high school students (grades 10-12). When broken down by language status, 54% of the responses were from language minority students (LMS) versus 46% from non-language minority students (non-LMS).[3]

Elementary Desegregation Sample

Of the 579 survey responses from parents with children at the elementary school level, 479 parents had indicated that their child was attending a school

---

1 See Appendix.

2 "Minority" is defined as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black--not of Hispanic origin, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and Pilipino. "Majority" is defined as White--not of Hispanic origin. These terms are currently misnomers in San José Unified, as in many other school districts, as the "minority" students now comprise a majority of the student population.

3 Second Semi-Annual Report: Vasquez v. San José Unified School District. Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor. August 1987. pp. 16-17.

other than their neighborhood school and was therefore eligible for desegregation transportation. This figure was 14.5% of the district estimate of 3,304.[1]

The demographic picture of this group follows: 67% were from minority households versus 33% from majority. This reflects the district's estimated minority/majority breakdown of elementary students eligible for desegregation transportation (62%/38%).[2] When broken down by ethnic group, the survey sample was comprised of 54% Hispanics, 33% White--not of Hispanic origin, and 12% other minorities. A little more than half the respondents (51%) were from parents of language minority students.

Geographically, 25% said they were attending an elementary school in the northern region of the district, 56% a school in the central region, and 19% a school in the southern region. As for their neighborhood school area, 34% were from the northern region of the district, 39% were from the central region, 18% were from the southern region, and 8% indicated schools not in the San José Unified School District.

Choice Related Survey Results and Discussion

Current School Choice[3]

Of those parents who responded to this question, almost two-thirds (63%) said that they had received their first choice, 24% said that they had received some lesser choice, and 13% said that their child's current school was no choice of theirs.

---

1 Transportation Data Report #32-A. Office of Desegregation. San José Unified School District. January 27, 1987.

2 ibid.

3 See Tables 1A, 2A, 3A in the Appendix.

There was a difference in school choice between majority and minority responses. For majority parents, 72% listed their child's current school as their first choice, 20% listed some lesser choice, and 8% said that their child's current school was no choice of theirs. This was contrasted with minority parents where 57% listed their child's current school as their first choice, 26% listed some lesser choice, and 15% said that their child's current school was no choice of theirs. Thus, for this sample of elementary students, majority children were assigned to their first choice school at a higher rate than minority children. And, minority children were assigned to a school which they had no choice in at a higher rate than majority children.

As can be expected, given the large number of language minority student responses, the breakdown for language minority and non-language minority students showed the same trends as for minority and majority students. Compared to non-language minority students, a lower proportion of language minority students received their first choice and a higher proportion said that they had no choice in their current school.

As for the choice breakdown for children **attending** schools in the three regions of the district, about the same proportion of northern and central school region students were attending their first choice school (69% and 70%, respectively) versus only 38% of children attending southern elementary schools. The figures for those parents indicating that they had no choice in their child's current school assignment also showed a marked difference between regions of the district -- 22% of southern school children versus 11% of northern and 7% of central school children.

The figures for neighborhood school regions were almost identical between the three regions. About 62% indicated that their child's current school

was their first choice in all three regions. Those who said that the choice was not theirs ranged from 11% in the south to 14% in the north.

This disparity between majority versus minority choice of assigned school and the disparity between school choice based on northern and central versus southern assigned school region for our sample of students attending non-neighborhood schools reflect certain facts about the school district. About 50% more minority students were attending a school which was outside of their neighborhood residence area than majority students.[1] Also, in Phase II of the Student Assignment Plan as noted previously, minority students participated at almost twice the number of majority students, and both majority and minority students were much less likely to be assigned their first choice than in Phase I. Finally, minority households and schools were concentrated in the north and majority households and schools in the south. Therefore minority (majority) students participating in the desegregation effort in the majority-segregated schools in the south would tend to come from the north (south).

Even though our survey results showed that minority children were assigned their first choice school at a lesser rate than majority children, a far greater number and percentage of minority children than majority children at the elementary school level were participating, voluntarily (assigned to school of their choice) or involuntarily (no choice in school assigned), in the desegregation process by attending schools outside of their neighborhood residence area. And the degree of <u>voluntary</u> participation, as evidenced by being assigned to a higher choice school, was less for minority students versus majority students.

---

[1] Summary of Student Residence Assignments. Office of Desegregation. San José Unified School District. September 17, 1986.

Basis of Current School Choice[1]

Parents/guardians were asked on what basis they chose the school their child was currently attending. Possible responses were: 1) the child previously attended that school, 2) the Catalog of Educational Opportunities, 3) a school visit, 4) the reputation of the school, 5) the school's program, 6) the brochures, 7) the school's closeness to home, 8) the school choice was not theirs, and 9) some other basis for school choice. Since parents often would indicate more than one basis for their school choice each basis was looked at separately. Overall, the **school's program** was chosen the most times by the parents of elementary desegregation students. School reputation, previous attendance, and the Catalog of Educational Opportunities received the second, third, and fourth highest number of votes. The rest of the bases were, in decreasing order: some other basis for school choice, school choice was not theirs, a school visit, the school's closeness to home, and the brochures.

The fact that school program was the basis most often indicated by parents might be a measure of the positive influence the existence of magnet schools, specialty enrichment programs, and programs of excellence had in the desegregation process. The importance of school reputation and previous attendance by the child seems logical as important bases of school choice. However, this fact may also act as a resisting force for future desegregation, especially since our sample was focused on those parents choosing to desegregate. For the other 69% of elementary students who were not attending schools outside of their neighborhood attendance area, the lure of special programs may not be enough to counteract the past opinions of a school's reputation (e.g., "minority schools in the north are worse than majority schools in the south") or the

---

[1] See Tables 1B, 2B, 3B in the Appendix.

continuing dynamic of desiring to have their child attend their neighborhood school because of past or current attendance by the child, the child's older siblings, or the child's neighborhood friends.

Looking at the breakdown of basis for school choice by majority/minority, there was a striking difference in what each group based its decision on. By far, the number one reason expressed by majority parents was the **school program**; this was followed by school reputation, previous attendance, and a school visit. Minority parents had a different strategy for school choice. The most cited reason was the **Catalog of Educational Opportunities**, followed closely by no choice, other basis, school reputation, previous attendance, and school program.

The results for language status again reflected the same differences between minority and majority. Non-language minority students cited **school program**, school reputation, and previous attendance as the top three bases for their school choice. Language minority students cited the **Catalog of Educational Opportunities**, no choice, other basis, school program, school reputation, and previous attendance as their top reasons.

It is interesting to note one major difference between the responses of minority versus language minority students. Even though both groups listed the Catalog most often, it was cited relatively more times by parents of language minority students. This result stressed the importance of the Catalog for choosing a school by both minority and language minority students. Also, the relatively infrequent strategy of visiting the school for minority and language minority students versus majority students indicated a differential between the two groups in the type of information that was used or available.

An analogy illustrating the difference between the Catalog and a school visit as the basis of school choice might be choosing which car to buy based on 1) looking at dealers' catalogs or 2) visiting the car lot. It can be argued that the

degree of information, i.e., the quality of informed choice, is higher using the second strategy; in fact, you may even want to take the car out on a test drive before you decide to buy it.

The same may be said for the quality of informed choice based on the Catalog of Educational Opportunities as opposed to a school visit. Differences by ethnicity or language status in the resources, such as transportation available, skills, such as familiarity with working in a bureaucracy, and time, such as the ability to take time off from work, may continue to exacerbate differences in the access that these groups may have to various sources of information.

When a breakdown of the basis of school choice was done by neighborhood school region, the results paralleled those of majority versus minority. Children who lived in the northern region of the district relied primarily on the **Catalog** in making their school choice, whereas in the central and southern regions, **school program** was the number one basis.

The primary dependence on the Catalog by northern region, minority, and/or language minority students became a cause for alarm when an evaluation of the Catalog found three major limitations: "the accuracy of the translated versions in presenting the choices available . . . the reliability that the programs as represented in the catalog were available at the school site . . . the omission of relevant transportation information."[1] Thus, serious questions are raised about the degree of informed choice available to parents of these children, as well as others who relied heavily and/or exclusively on the Catalog.

Busing and Choice[2]

---

1 First Semi-Annual Report: Vasquez v. San José Unified School District. Office of the Desegregation Compliance Monitor. October 1986. p. 7.

2 See Tables 1C-D, 2C-D, 3C-D in the Appendix.

Overall, 74% of the 479 respondents indicated that they rode the bus. When disaggregated between majority and minority, of those who had indicated their ethnicity, 28% of those riding the bus were majority versus 72% minority students. Broken down by language status, 38% were non-language minority versus 62% language minority students. Finally, 40% of those respondents riding the bus lived in the northern region, 40% lived in the central region, and 20% lived in the southern region of the district. Therefore, if a student in our sample were minority, language minority, or lived in the northern or central region of the district, then he or she was more likely to have ridden the bus between school and home.

The final question considered related choice with information on transportation. Only 23% of the responses from both majority and non-language minority students indicated that more information regarding the length and distance of a child's bus ride would have caused the parent/guardian to choose another school. This is in sharp contrast to minority and language minority students. More than twice the proportion of minority (48%) and language minority (54%) students said that more bus information would have caused them to choose another school. When comparing the three regions, almost twice the number of respondents attending schools in both the central and southern regions said that more information would <u>not</u> have affected their school choice.; in the north, the answers were split fifty-fifty on this question.

Therefore, in regards to transportation information and choice, if a student were majority, non-language minority, or lived in the central or southern regions of the school district, their parents/guardians were much more likely to be satisfied with their school choice as far as any additional information on the buses was concerned. The opposite was true of minority and language minority students whose parents were more likely to indicate that they did not receive

adequate information concerning the buses when they made their initial school choices. These differences within ethnicity and language status could be due to the fact that majority and non-language minority students were shown to be riding the bus less. Also, these groups of students had a relatively larger percentage of first choice schools and relatively lower percentage of no choice schools than their counterparts. If your transportation needs are not dependent on the district or you already received your first choice school, then it is less likely that your school choice would be affected by an increase in your knowledge of bus services.

Conclusions

San José Unified School District will soon be entering its fourth year of desegregation. Much of the confusion and rough beginnings inherent in the first year of implementing the desegregation plan has been addressed to a greater or lesser degree. Currently, the district has succeeded in desegregating 25 of 26 schools with the expectation that all 26 schools will be desegregated for the 1989-90 school year. In Phase I - March 1989 of the student assignment process, the district projects that 94% of both majority (2,635) and minority (2,812) students will receive their first choice school.

However, the issues raised in this investigation about the question of informed choice still have some bearing in desegregation cases, including San José. Disparities between receiving first choice schools in Phase I versus Phase II of the assignment process continue to this day. And minority and language minority students continue to participate in Phase II at a higher number than majority students.

Concerns about the ability of minority and language minority students and parents to access various sources of information beyond the Catalog of Educational Opportunities still exist. This is of special concern to parents of LEP and NEP students who must choose between a myriad of educational approaches toward the provision of bilingual services, as well as sometimes face the reality that services advertised in the Catalog are not always available. Also, access to magnet schools by minority students is often limited by the minority enrollment caps at these historically minority-segregated schools, thereby limiting their choice options.

As long as inequalities in resources, skills, and time persist among different groups, school districts cannot sit back and expect informed choice to occur equally by all parents and students. Achieving and maintaining school desegregation is a dynamic, long-term challenge. Schools must continually make the extra effort to provide a wide range of approaches to inform present and potential future participants in degregation about schools, school programs, school processes, and the options they have available to themselves in order to ensure a stable, self-perpetuating, desegregated system in the long-run as well as the short-run.

TABLE 1-A: CHOICE# OF CHILD'S CURRENT SCHOOL BY MAJORITY/MINORITY

CHOICE #	MAJ STUDENTS			MIN STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
First	97	72%	43%	126	57%	57%	223	100%
Other than first	27	20%	31%	60	27%	69%	87	100%
No choice	11	8%	24%	34	15%	76%	45	100%
TOTAL	135	100%		220	100%		355	

TABLE 1-B: BASIS OF SCHOOL CHOICE BY MAJORITY/MINORITY

BASIS FOR CHOICE	MAJ STUDENTS			MIN STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
Previous attendance	42	14%	45%	51	12%	55%	93	100%
Catalog of Ed. Opps.	24	8%	26%	68	17%	74%	92	100%
School Visit	38	13%	53%	34	8%	47%	72	100%
School Reputation	48	16%	47%	54	13%	53%	102	100%
School Program	71	24%	59%	49	12%	41%	120	100%
Brochures	1	0%	17%	5	1%	83%	6	100%
Close to Home	17	6%	31%	38	9%	69%	55	100%
No Choice	21	7%	27%	57	14%	73%	78	100%
Other Basis	31	11%	36%	55	13%	64%	86	100%
TOTAL	293	100%		411	100%			

* 475 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 1-C: DOES YOUR CHILD TAKE THE BUS?
BY MAJORITY/MINORITY

BUSED?	MAJ STUDENTS			MIN STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	61	39%	50%	62	20%	50%	123	100%
Yes	97	61%	28%	255	80%	72%	352	100%
TOTAL	158	100%		317	100%		475	

* 475 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 1-D: CHOICE CHANGED IF MORE BUS INFO?
BY MAJORITY/MINORITY

CHANGE CHOICE W/ MORE BUS INFO?	MAJ STUDENTS			MIN STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	86	77%	38%	138	52%	62%	224	100%
Yes	25	23%	16%	127	48%	84%	152	100%
TOTAL	111	100%		265	100%		376	

* 376 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 2-A: CHOICE# OF CHILD'S CURRENT SCHOOL BY LANGUAGE STATUS

CHOICE #	NON-LMS STUDENTS			LMS STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
First	126	70%	59%	88	56%	41%	214	100%
Other than first	42	23%	51%	41	26%	49%	83	100%
No choice	12	7%	30%	28	18%	70%	40	100%
TOTAL	180	100%		157	100%		337	

TABLE 2-B: BASIS OF SCHOOL CHOICE BY LANGUAGE STATUS

BASIS FOR CHOICE	NON-LMS STUDENTS			LMS STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
Previous attendance	58	16%	65%	31	11%	35%	89	100%
Catalog of Ed. Opps.	30	8%	33%	62	21%	67%	92	100%
School Visit	47	13%	68%	22	8%	32%	69	100%
School Reputation	64	17%	67%	31	11%	33%	95	100%
School Program	77	21%	71%	32	11%	29%	109	100%
Brochures	1	0%	17%	5	2%	83%	6	100%
Close to Home	36	10%	65%	19	6%	35%	55	100%
No Choice	21	6%	30%	50	17%	70%	71	100%
Other Basis	40	11%	49%	41	14%	51%	81	100%
TOTAL	374	100%		293	100%			

* 452 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 2-C: DOES YOUR CHILD TAKE THE BUS?
BY LANGUAGE STATUS

BUSED?	NON-LMS STUDENTS			LMS STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	81	39%	68%	38	16%	32%	119	100%
Yes	127	61%	38%	206	84%	62%	333	100%
TOTAL	208	100%		244	100%		452	

* 452 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 2D: CHOICE CHANGED IF MORE BUS INFO?
BY LANGUAGE STATUS

CHANGE CHOICE W/ MORE BUS INFO?	NON-LMS STUDENTS			LMS STUDENTS			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	120	77%	56%	94	46%	44%	214	100%
Yes	35	23%	24%	111	54%	76%	146	100%
TOTAL	155	100%		205	100%		360	

* 360 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 3-A: CHOICE# OF CHILD'S CURRENT SCHOOL BY NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL REGION

CHOICE #	NORTHERN HOME			CENTRAL HOME			SOUTHERN HOME			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
First	67	61%		95	63%		46	62%		208	1.8696
Other than first	27	25%		36	24%		20	27%		83	0.758
No choice	15	14%		19	13%		8	11%		42	0.3724
TOTAL	109	100%		150	100%		74	100%		333	300%

TABLE 3-B: BASIS OF SCHOOL CHOICE BY NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL REGION

BASIS FOR CHOICE	NORTHERN HOME			CENTRAL HOME			SOUTHERN HOME			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
Previous attendance	34	14%	40%	28	10%	33%	23	17%	27%	85	100%
Catalog of Ed. Opps.	45	18%	51%	39	14%	44%	5	4%	6%	89	100%
School Visit	20	8%	28%	36	13%	50%	16	12%	22%	72	100%
School Reputation	35	14%	37%	38	13%	40%	21	15%	22%	94	100%
School Program	28	11%	24%	54	19%	47%	34	25%	29%	116	100%
Brochures	6	2%	86%	1	0%	14%	0	0%	0%	7	100%
Close to Home	12	5%	26%	23	8%	50%	11	8%	24%	46	100%
No Choice	30	12%	41%	30	11%	41%	14	10%	19%	74	100%
Other Basis	35	14%	43%	35	12%	43%	12	9%	15%	82	100%
TOTAL	245	100%		284	100%		136	100%			

* 439 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 3-C: DOES YOUR CHILD TAKE THE BUS?
BY NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL REGION

BUSED?	NORTHERN HOME			CENTRAL HOME			SOUTHERN HOME			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	32	20%	29%	57	30%	51%	23	26%	21%	112	100%
Yes	131	80%	40%	131	70%	40%	65	74%	20%	327	100%
TOTAL	163	100%		188	100%		88	100%		439	

* 439 out of 479 responded to both questions.

TABLE 3-D: CHOICE CHANGED IF MORE BUS INFO?
BY NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL REGION

CHANGE CHOICE W/ MORE BUS INFO?	NORTHERN HOME			CENTRAL HOME			SOUTHERN HOME			TOTAL	
	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	COL(%)	ROW(%)	NO.	(%)
No	67	50%	32%	102	69%	49%	40	63%	19%	209	100%
Yes	68	50%	49%	46	31%	33%	24	38%	17%	138	100%
TOTAL	135	100%		148	100%		64	100%		347	

* 347 out of 479 responded to both questions.

PARENT SURVEY

PLEASE FILL THE ANSWER TO EACH QUESTION IN THE SPACE PROVIDED

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Name of school your child is currently attending_____

Child's current grade level _____

Name of school nearest your home

_____

Your child's ethnicity (please check one)
___American Indian or Alaskan Native
___Asian
___Filipino
___Pacific Islander
___Black, not of Hispanic origin
___White, not of Hispanic origin
___Hispanic

PLEASE CHECK THE ANSWER WHICH APPLIES:

1a. How does your child get to school?
___car pool? ___car?
_____how often (per week, each way)
1b.
___ Yellow school bus
___ County Transit
___student drives self
_____how often (per week, each way)
_____other (please explain)

2. If your child is not taking a bus, why not?
_____ride too long
_____unsafe bus stop
_____walks to school
_____ I drive my child to school
_____other (please explain)

3a. What would have to change before you would allow your child to ride a bus to school?

_____

3b. Would your child take the bus if the ride were shorter? ___yes ___no

4a. If your child is riding a bus, how long is your child on the bus *in the morning?*
___15 - 30 minutes ___30 - 45 minutes
___45 - 60 minutes ___60 - 90 minutes
___more than 90 minutes

4b. *in the afternoon?* ___15 - 30 minutes
___ 30 - 45 minutes ___45 - 60 minutes
___60 - 90 minutes
___more than 90 minutes

5. What is the total distance from your house to your child's school bus stop?
___less than 5 blocks ___between 5 and 10 blocks ___between 10 and 15 blocks

6. Is the school that your child is currently attending your choice in the District?
___ yes ___no
If so, is it your ___1st choice?
___ 2nd choice? ___3rd choice?
___ 4th choice? _____other

7. On what basis did you choose the school that your child is currently attending?
___ previously attended that school.
___Catalog of Educational Opportunities.
___a visit to the school.
___reputation of the school
___the program
___the brochures
___closeness to home.
___choice was not mine.
_____other

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE BOX:

8. Does the school bus that your child is currently riding have an adult monitor (other than the driver) riding with the children?
___yes ___no ___don't know

9. If you had more information regarding the length and distance of your child's bus ride, would you have chosen another school?
_____yes _____no

10. Whom do you call for school bus service information?
___your school principal
___District Desegregation Office
___Information & Enrollment Center
___Transportation Department
_____ other

11. Was your question answered:
__immediately ___rarely ___never

12. If there were one thing about the transportation system that you could improve, what would it be?
___decrease travel time
___bus grouping by grade level
___sheltered bus stops
___discontinue use of county transit
___express routes
_____other

PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE ENCLOSED SELF/ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.